

REMARKS

The Office Action objected to Claims 5 and 12 due to informalities. Applicant has amended Claims 5 and 12 to overcome the objections and respectfully requests that the objection be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §112. Applicant has amended the claim to overcome the rejection and respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Applicant has amended the claims to provide more clarity to the invention and has not amended the claims to overcome the current rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 and 35 U.S.C. §103.

The present invention allows a user to visually process the similarities and differences between two Web pages in an easier and more efficient manner. The present invention displays an original Web page and a similar Web page simultaneously in a single window. When a part of the original Web page is displayed, the corresponding similar part of the similar Web page is also displayed in synchronicity. Thus, for example, when the user scrolls through the part in the original Web page, the similar part in the similar Web page is also scrolled. (Pg. 14, lns. 21 – 27) This allows the user to view simultaneously the similar portions of the two Web pages for comparison purposes. Any term which is selected in the original Web page can be highlighted in the similar corresponding Web page. (Pg. 15, lns. 15 – 22) In addition, the present invention also determines the existence of any differences between the two Web pages which can be easily viewed by the user. (Pg. 13, lns. 7 – 11) Thus, the present invention allows an easy comparison between two Web pages.

The Office Action rejected claims 1, and 6-16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over *Donker et al.* (U.S. 7,219,162).

[T]he dispositive question regarding anticipation is whether one skilled in the art would reasonably understand or infer from the prior art reference's teaching that every claim [limitation] was disclosed in that single reference.

Dayco Prods., Inc. v. Total Containment, Inc., F.3d 1358, 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2003)

Donker discloses searching and displaying links to other versions of a target link so that a user can select whether he/she wants to display a Web page corresponding to the target link or display cached Web pages corresponding to other versions of the target link.

Donker does not teach or suggest:

[A] Web page display control portion that displays the similar Web pages specified by the similar Web page finding portion together with the basic Web page and synchronized with an operation to the basic Web page.

The Office Action cites to Column 2, lines 12 to 16 in *Donker* for the alleged features of the present invention. However, *Donker* only discloses that links to alternate Web pages are simultaneously displayed. *Donker* does not disclose that the alternate Web pages themselves are displayed along with the original Web page. As *Donker* notes, “the alternative web pages are viewed by a mouse-over of the hotlink, whereby the hotlinks of alternative web pages are visually displayed to the user.” (Col. 4, ln. 67 – Col. 5, ln. 2) Displaying links are not the same as displaying the alternate Web pages in a visual comparison manner. In addition, the display of the alternate Web pages are not synchronized with the display of the original Web page. *Donker* teaches that in an alternate embodiment, “the user is automatically directed to the alternative URL with the best performance upon selection of the original hyperlink, thereby avoiding having to manually type a URL into a search field of a search engine.” Thus, *Donker* visits the

alternative Web site directly and does not display it simultaneously with the original Web page or in synchronicity with the original Web page.

Donker also has no need to synchronize the Web pages since the original Web page is already deleted and the links to the cached versions are presented for the user to select because the original Web page is unavailable.

In contrast, in the present invention, “a similar Web page is found from the compared Web site and presented synchronously with the basic Web page” as shown, for example, in FIG. 11. (Pg. 14, lns. 13 – 16) For example, when a user scrolls up or down a window in the basic Web page, a paragraph in a similar Web page that is similar to a paragraph in the basic Web page is automatically scrolled up or down and presented to the user. (Pg. 14, lns. 21 – 27)

All arguments for Claim 1 are repeated and incorporated herein for Claims 13 and 15.

With respect to Claim 8, *Donker* does not teach or suggest

[W]herein the Web page display control portion displays the basic Web page and the similar Web page on a same window.

Donker only allows the user to view links to the other alternative Web pages in the same window as the target link, but does not display the alternative Web pages, themselves, in the same window as the target link. (Col. 4, ln. 67 – Col. 5, ln. 2)

In contrast, in the present invention, the basic Web page and the similar Web page are displayed in the same window as shown in FIG. 11.

With respect to Claim 10, *Donker* does not teach or suggest

[W]herein the Web page display control portion displays a word in the similar Web page that is the same as a word that is selected in the basic Web page in a mode different from other word out of the similar Web page.

There is no indication that *Donker* highlights the words in the similar Web page or display the words in the similar Web page in any other type of different mode.

In contrast, in the present invention, a word selected by a user in the basic Web page is presented in a mode different from the other words such that the selected word is highlighted in the similar Web page. This allows the user to obtain similar information viscerally. (Pg. 15, lns. 17 – 22; Figure 14).

With respect to Claim 11, *Donker* fails to disclose

[A] difference Web page finding portion that specifies a difference Web page as a Web page having difference information that is contained in the basic Web page and that is not contained in the similar Web page from the compared Web site.

The Office Action on Page 6 cites to the links to the alternative Web sites for a target link in *Donker* for the features of the present invention. The links, however, are not the Web sites themselves. In addition, the alternative Web sites are sites which are cached versions of the Web site which correspond to the target link and do not have difference information between the alternative Web site and the Web site which corresponds to the target link. *Donker* also does not teach performing any sort of processing to determine the difference between the alternate Web sites and the Web site corresponding to the target link.

In contrast, the present invention recognizes that all the content contained in the basic Web page is not necessarily contained in the similar Web page. Thus, the difference Web page finding portion finds paragraphs where the content in the similar Web page is different from the content in the basic Web page. (Pg. 13, lns. 7 – 26) This allows a user to easily ascertain differences between the two Web pages.

The Office Action also rejected Claims 2-5 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over *Donker* in view of *Nagano et al.* (U.S. 7,493,252).

Nagano discloses a method to improve review of customer complaints or inquiries by extracting information from the complaints or inquiries to categorize and group them. (Col. 3, lns. 7 – 11) It accomplishes, for example, by reviewing the text of the complaint or inquiry and extracting concepts. (Col. 4, ln. 61 – Col. 5, ln. 44).

All arguments for patentability with respect to Claim 1 are repeated and incorporated herein for Claims 2 – 5. Furthermore, *Nagano* does not remedy the deficiencies of *Donker*.

With respect to Claim 17, neither *Donker* or *Nagano* teach or suggest

[W]herein when the part of the basic Web page is scrolled, the Web page display control portion scrolls the part of the similar Web page that is similar to the part of the basic Web page.

There is no indication that *Donker* discloses that the Web pages corresponding to the alternative Web pages are scrolled when the original Web page is scrolled. *Nagano* also does not remedy the deficiencies of *Donker*.

With respect to Claim 18, *Donker* and *Nagano* fail to disclose

[W]herein the word in the similar Web page that is the same as the word that is selected in the basic Web page is highlighted.

Donker does not teach that the word in the similar Web page that is the same as the word selected in the basic Web page is highlighted. *Nagano* also does not remedy the deficiencies of *Donker*.

Dependent Claims 2 – 12, 14, and 16 – 19 depend from and further define Independent Claims 1, 13, and 15 and are thus allowable, too.

It is now believed that the present application is allowable and an early notification of allowance is requested.

If the Examiner has any questions with regards to the prosecution of this matter, the undersigned attorney can be contacted at the listed telephone number.

Very truly yours,

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.



Joseph W. Price
Registration No. 25,124
600 Anton Boulevard, Suite 1400
Costa Mesa, CA 92626
Telephone: (714) 427-7420
Facsimile: (714) 427-7799